



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,194	12/28/2001	James Edward Christensen	YOR9-2001-0554 (8728-538)	2835
46069 7590 03/31/2008 F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797			EXAMINER SHAW, PELING ANDY	
			ART UNIT 2144	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/31/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/036,194
Filing Date: December 28, 2001
Appellant(s): CHRISTENSEN ET AL.

Nathaniel T. Wallace
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 12/31/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 11/27/2006 and the Advisory action mailed 02/13/2007.

In the cover sheet, Applicant has mistaken in stating that claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as per Office action dated 11/27/2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief does not mention an after final amendment dated 01/29/2007. However the appellant does mention, on the cover sheet of current appeal brief filed, the Advisory action mailed 02/13/2007 in response to the after final amendment.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal in the brief is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 6304892 B1	Bhoj et al.	10-2001
US 20020138286 A1	Engstrom	09-2002

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 1-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Engstrom (US 20020138286 A1), hereinafter referred as Engstrom.
 - a. Regarding claim 1, Engstrom disclosed a method for providing access to an electronic profile of a first client to a second client comprising the steps of: creating a network accessible electronic profile of the first client, wherein the electronic profile is accessible by an active object, wherein the active object is bound to the electronic profile (Fig. 8; abstract, paragraph 39); defining an access right of the second client, wherein the access right determines a portion of the electronic profile of available to the second client via the active object (paragraph 40: where access right is given to a second client to communicate); verifying an identity of the second client; and providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object, wherein the active object is transferred to the second client form the first client (paragraph 23).
 - b. Regarding claim 2, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of defining a second access right of a third client wherein the access right

determines a portion of the electronic profile available to the third client via the active object (Fig. 8).

- c. Regarding claim 3, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the active object is an network accessible active object (Fig. 8).
- d. Regarding claims 4 and 5, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein electronic profile comprises location information of the first client and wherein electronic profile comprises status information of the first client (paragraph 21: address).
- e. Regarding claim 6, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein electronic profile comprises a communication channel of the first client (paragraph 40: chat channel).
- f. Regarding claim 7, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the step of defining the access right further comprises the step of defining the access right according to a predefined access right specifying a portion of the electronic profile accessible to the second client (paragraphs 22-23).
- g. Regarding claim 8, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 7, wherein the electronic profile is associated with one or more clients (Fig. 8).
- h. Regarding claim 9, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of limiting the portion of the electronic profile provided by the active object according to a preference of the second client (paragraph 18).
- i. Regarding claim 10, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the active object enables the second client to contact the first client (paragraph 40).

- j. Regarding claim 11, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, comprising the steps: specifying, in the electronic profile, a communication channel of the first client accessible to the second client; and establishing the communication channel between the first client and the second client upon selecting the communication channel, wherein the active object comprises means for selecting the communication channel (paragraph 40).
- k. Regarding claim 12, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the electronic profile notifies the first client upon an access of the electronic profile (paragraph 18).
- l. Regarding claim 13, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein at least one of the first client and the second client is a role satisfied by one or more users (paragraphs 18 and 39).
- m. Regarding claim 14, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of specifying means for transacting funds (paragraphs 5 and 24).
- n. Regarding claim 15, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 14, wherein the means for transacting funds is specified in the electronic profile (paragraph 24).
- o. Regarding claim 16, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 14, further comprising the step of charging a fee for transacting funds between the first client and the second client (paragraph 25).
- p. Regarding claim 17, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 14, wherein the means for transacting funds dynamically determines one of a source and a

destination of funds of the first client according to a property of the transaction (paragraph 25).

- q. Regarding claim 18, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of authenticated the electronic profile (claim 27: by priority identity).
- r. Regarding claim 19, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of authenticating information disclosed by the electronic profile (paragraph 5).
- s. Regarding claims 20 and 21, Engstrom disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of automatically modifying the access right of the second client according to a variable defined in the electronic profile; and wherein the access right changes over time as a function of a relationship between the first party and the second party (paragraph 5: limit individual access).
- t. Claim 23 is of the same scope as claim 1. It is rejected for the same reasons as for claim 1.

Engstrom disclosed all limitations of claims 1-21 and 23. Claims 1-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

2. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engstrom in view of Bhoj et al. (US 6304892 B1), hereinafter referred as Bhoj.

- a. Engstrom shows claim 1 as above. Engstrom does not show storing a contract template, wherein the contract template comprises a plurality of roles and a plurality of access rights, wherein each role is associated with at least on access

right; staffing each role with one of the first client and the second client, wherein the first client and the second client each provide access to corresponding electronic profiles accessible by corresponding active objects; and assigning access rights to the first client and second client according to the contract template and the active objects. However Engstrom does show staffing and assigning access right (paragraph 40).

- b. Bhoj shows using and storing contract templates derived from the predetermined access agreement to filter all the management data of the second data service system into the selective management data (claim 1-3) in an analogous art for the purpose of selective data exchanges across federated environments.
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Engstrom's functions of generating personas with Bhoj's functions of selective data exchanges.
- d. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use a limited set of data pertaining an individual entity per Engstrom (paragraph 18: dynamic profile) and Bhoj (abstract: selective management data) 's teaching in the form of personal profile for other's access per Engstrom (paragraph 18: dynamic profile for content or service provider)'s teaching or in the form or contract template for service agreement per Bhoj (claim 1-3: contract template for selective data access)'s teaching as both Engstrom and Engstrom are in the field of limiting data access and require similar implementation functionalities, e.g. dynamic profiles and contract template.

Together Engstrom and Bhoj disclosed all limitations of claim 41. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

(10) Response to Argument

In response to Appellant's argument on claims 1 and 23 as per item i of section VII on pages 6-8 of current Appeal Brief Filed:

1. Appellant argues that Engstrom does not teach "providing access to the portion electronic profile to the second client via the active object, wherein the active object is transferred to the second client from the first client" (page 6) as per claim 1 in section 8 on page 10 of current Appeal Brief Filed. Examiner has reviewed the claim rejection as per item 1.a in section 9, i.e. Grounds of Rejection, above. Engstrom has disclosed an application as per Fig. 1 and paragraphs 21, 23, 25 and 28 generating and submitting personality profile for accessing to on-line content and/or service. Engstrom has further disclosed (Fig. 8, abstract and paragraph 39) that in the context of chat hosting service 832, personality profile service 825 facilitates generation of unique and/or customizable personas for use by a first client in connection with a chat session between the first client and a second or more clients. The personality profile service is used in connecting the first client and a second or more clients with a chat session. Thus the personality profile service provides an enablement to the connection of the first client and a second or more clients.

2. Applicant has argued (middle of page 7) that Engstrom does not teach providing an active object to the Content Provider to access any other entity (as per applicant's previous argument in the middle of page 8 of amendment filed on 01/29/2007) that Engstrom does not teaching providing an active object to the Content Provider to access the registration information. Applicant has stated that per Engstrom indeed, the

registration information is provided directly to the Content Provider and however no such indirect access method/system is taught (bottom of page 7 to the top of page 8 in amendment filed on 01/29/2007). Examiner has responded in Advisory Action dated 02/13/2007 as quoted:

Examiner has reviewed applicant's reference to "active object" and found in the original claim language, an active object is a web browser (applicant's original claim 27 language). Engstrom has twice referred to browser, i.e. paragraphs 22 and 43, and has stated (paragraph 23) that client browses content pages.

3. Applicant argues that nowhere does Engstrom teach "verifying an identity of the second client" (page 7) as per claim 1 in section 8 on page 10 of current Appeal Brief Filed. Examiner has reviewed the claim rejection per item 1.a in section 9 and found Engstrom does disclose (paragraph 23) the need to submit personally identifiable information to content provider for registering with content provider. This is consistent with the alleged limitation of "verifying an identity of the second client".

(11) *Related Proceeding(s) Appendix*

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Peling A Shaw

/P. A. S./

Examiner, Art Unit 2144

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144

Conferees:

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151